DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 406 SO 011 400

AUTHOR Havighurst, Robert J.
TITLE Anthropology and Cultural Pluralism. Three Case Studies: Australia, New Zealand and USA.
INSTITUTION New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the International Congress of the Anthropoligical and Ethnological Sciences (9th, Chicago, Illinois, 1973); Best copy available; Parts may be marginally legible due to print quality

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; American Indian Culture; *Anthropology; Case Studies; Change Agents; Changing Attitudes; *Cultural Pluralism; Interaction Process Analysis; Literature Reviews; Minority Groups; *Policy Formation; *Social Change; *Social History; Social Integration; Social Relations; Sociocultural Patterns; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS Aboriginal People; Australia; Maoris; New Zealand; United States

ABSTRACT

A historical overview of cultural attitudes in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States reveals that anthropologists greatly influenced the interaction between the Western "modern" culture and the primitive native culture in those countries. Historical analysis of attitudes toward Aborigines, Maoris, and American Indians provides the basis for this study. In all three countries, crucial periods occured when policies were formed which aimed to control the relations between the native and more modern cultures. The first period (1850-1859) was characterized by the pseudo-anthropological belief of "survival of the fittest." At this time all three countries felt that the native population would disappear. When it became clear that this would not happen, an attitude of assimilation emerged which assumed that the native groups would be merged into the dominant societies. Influential anthropologists during this period were Elkin ("The Australian Aborigines," 1928, 1958), and Firth ("Economics of the New Zealand Maori, 1928, 1959). Anthropologists in the United States did not have as much influence on assimilation theories and policies as did those in Australia and New Zealand. When the assimilation theory was found to be inadequate during the 1960's, anthropologists took an active part in defining cultural pluralism. Stanner, the Berndts, and Rowley in Australia, Hunn and Schwimmer in New Zealand, and Mead and Lurie in the United States were especially influential. Current activities of anthropologists concerned with fostering the movement toward cultural pluralism emphasize the education of policy makers, the public, and minority groups. (KC)

ED164406

MAR 22 1979

Anthropology and Cultural Pluralism

Three case studies: Australia, New Zealand and USA

Text of a paper presented at the 9th International Congress of the Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Chicago, 1973

by Robert J. Havighurst

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Claire A. Sutherland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New Zealand Council for Educational Research
Wellington, 1974

SO-011400

INTRODUCTION

In what is now Australia, New Zealand, and the USA, there have been three remarkably parallel cases of interaction of a western 'modern' culture with a primitive culture. Beginning at various times between about 1600 and 1800, this interaction appears to have followed a similar sequence of phases in all three areas, with the contemporary phase (movement toward cultural pluralism) starting at about the same time, around 1960. The purpose of this paper is to examine the functions of research and teaching of anthropology in the evolution of the cross-cultural interaction in these three countries.

In each of them, the Anglo[1] society wanted land which its members could settle and exploit, although it meant uprooting and pushing out a resident society which was not equipped by technology or the necessary values to cope with the aggressive and instrumental invaders. In each country, they came in such numbers that the native society was soon vastly outnumbered. At

1. English-speaking people.

present, the proportions of the native peoples are: New Zealand, 8 percent; Australia, 0.8 percent; and USA, 0.4 percent.

The interaction between the Anglo and the native societies has followed a similar course in all three cases, as has been pointed out by anthropologists who have studied the process. Two men took the lead in making this analysis in Australasia: Raymond Firth for New Zealand and A.P. Elkin for Australia. A number of Americans have used a similar conceptual scheme, though it has not been stated so explicity.

Briefly, the sequence of phases or stages is:

1. Tentative and cautious initial contacts, generally with an emphasis on trade rather than settlement of the land.

2. Settlement and colonization by the Anglo society, which takes land from the natives.

3. Resistance from natives to land takeover, physical conflict, and defeat of the natives.

4. Native retreat and withdrawal to reserves, reservations, or isolated strongholds. Native population reduced to its lowest number.

5. Anglo society develops a policy of assimilation of the dwindling native society, which is accepted by some of its members.

6. Assimilation policy is seen as inadequate by Anglos and natives. Problems of socio-economic adjustment arise, with rapid population increase of native people, migration to the cities, and protest movements.

7. Rise of a movement for cultural pluralism – a plurality of cultures with their members seeking to live together in amity and mutual understanding and mutual cooperation, but maintaining separate cultures.

Having studied this kind of interaction in all three countries, I regard anthropologists as the central ideologists in the movement from a policy of *assimilation* to one of *cultural pluralism*. The seven phases or stages appear in all three countries, but with significant differences, which I have been studying, along with the similarities. I now propose to trace the interaction of anthropologists with the political and intellectual leadership of the country, as well as with the leaders of the native cultures. In this process, the educational system, through university teaching and research, through education of native people, through the activity of anthropologists as advisers, administrators, and political activists, has been the major instrument of societal change.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND INTERACTION OF CULTURES AT THREE POINTS IN THE SEQUENCE

There are three points in the sequence of interaction where a

policy aimed to control the relations between the two cultures is evident, though sometimes more implicit than explicit.

1. Defeat and Withdrawal

The first point is the period after the defeat of the natives, when they withdraw voluntarily or under pressure to relatively isolated areas. This is the period of minimum population. The natives are especially vulnerable to contagious diseases – influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, measles – to which the whites have some resistance. Furthermore, if there is such a thing as a 'will to live', this is at a low ebb at this juncture.

Although there was no branch of social science by the name of social anthropology at the time of this situation, there was interest in the conflict of cultures, and there was need for decisions on the part of the Anglo society as to what they should do about the native society, which was very much in their way – a kind of pest, at the least. The date for this period, in both New Zealand and Australia, was from about 1850 to 1890, by which time the Eastern Indians of the USA were also subdued and confined on reservations. There was what would now be called a pseudo-anthropology, growing out of the success of Charles Darwin's theory of human evolution. The *Descent of Man* was published in 1871, and immediately gave birth to a sociological version of evolutionary theory, namely, the doctrine of the survival of the fittest applied to societies and social institutions. According to this view of history, which Herbert Spencer's writings were thought to support, weaker forms of social organization were

destined to disappear in competition with stronger and more efficient forms. In this light, it was easy for European leaders in colonization and settlement of lands inhabited by simpler societies to believe that the European form of society was destined to survive, deserved to survive, and that the sooner the process of dispatching the weaker society was begun the better.

This attitude can be found expressed in various tracts that were written at the time as apologies for what was taking place, and which would now be branded as *genocide*. For example, a letter was published in a Melbourne newspaper, in 1876, which went as follows: 'We invoke and remorselessly fulfil the inexorable law of natural selection when exterminating the inferior Australian and Maori races ... The world is better for it: and could be incalculably better still, were we loyally to accept the lesson thus taught by nature – by preserving the varieties most perfect in every way; instead of actually promoting the non-survival of the fittest by protecting the propagation of the improvident, the diseased, the defective, and the criminal. Thus we surely lower the average of, and tend to destroy, the human race almost as surely as if we were openly to resort to communism.'[2]

The actual disappearance of the native society did seem imminent, for the natives were decreasing in number, and seemed weak

---

2. Rusden, H.K., 'Labor and Capital', in *Melbourne Review*, vol. 1, p. 78 (1876). Quoted in Stevens, *Racism: The Australian Experience, vol. 2, Black versus white*, p. 16.

in almost every sense. The Australians spoke of a policy 'to ease the dying pillow' for the Aborigine. They could do this partly by feeding and clothing the people who would come to a depot on a reservation, without expecting them to do anything constructive about their own conditions. Furthermore, if there had been much miscegenation, as there had been in Australia, and to a considerable extent in some areas of major contact in USA and New Zealand, it was assumed that the mixed bloods would continue to intermarry with whites, and thus the native 'blood' would become absorbed in another two or three generations, and the race would be effectively 'whitened'.

In the USA, between about 1865 and 1890, there was a similar belief on the part of many people in positions of power that no feature of Indian life was worth preserving, and that Indians would never contribute anything vital or distinctive to American life, as long as they remained in the tribal state. An American medical doctor, by the name of Thomas J. Mays, wrote in the *Popular Science Monthly* in 1888 that 'Nature steps in and adds more toward a solution of the difficulties of the Indian problem than statesmanship has ever accomplished', meaning that the Indian race would soon disappear by a process of miscegenation, aided by disease that would take off the full-bloods. [3]

Forty years before, President Andrew Jackson had struck a

---

3. Mays, T.J., M.D., 'The Future of the American Indian', in *Appleton's Popular Science Monthly*, vol. 33, pp. 104-8 (1888).

similar note in his Farewell Address upon retiring from the Presidency. In March 1837, he took credit for ridding the eastern and central states of the Indians, saying: 'The states which had so long been retarded in their improvement by the Indian tribes residing in the midst of them are at length relieved from the evil, and this unhappy race – the original dwellers in our land – are now placed in a situation where we may well hope that they will share in the blessings of civilization.'[4]

2. *Assimilation Policy*

The second point at which a new policy had to be created was when it became clear that the native race would not disappear of its own accord, but was growing in numbers and was meeting adjustment problems which were also problems for the dominant society. At this point, anthropology was developing rapidly as a social science, and anthropologists were studying the native races in terms of social organization and social change. They, of course, became intensely aware of the problem of interaction of vigorous cultures, and a number of them became involved as advisers, policy-makers, administrators, and educators. Furthermore, they appreciated the native cultures, and if there should be a controversy, they were disposed to speak for them.

At this point, the assimilation policy emerged, with support from anthropology. The policy assumed that the native group would

4. Quoted in Morison, *The Oxford History of the American People*, p. 451.

become merged into the dominant society, through processes of education, employment, citizenship - all by forms of joint participation in which the natives learned how to take part efficiently in the dominant society. For example, in Australia in 1951, a Conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers on Native Welfare declared as policy that Aborigines 'shall attain the same manner of living as other Australians'.

A.P. Elkin , the Australian anthropologist, was a leader in the drive for a policy of assimilation. He came to the University of Sydney as Professor of Anthropology in 1934 after a period of field work in the north and centre of Australia, and he spoke and wrote vigorously to support his thesis that the Aborigines had a culture which should be respected, and that a positive policy of health services, education, and employment should be put into effect, with the aim of preparing Aborigines for life in the general Australian community. His book on *The Australian Aborigines* (1928) was influential in giving people a more positive attitude toward the Aboriginals. His position was taken up by younger anthropologists generally, and he was consulted by government officials. At about this time, the name of the Aborigines' Protective Board in New South Wales was changed to Aborigines' Welfare Board, signifying the change of policy. The term 'assimilation' was written into the New South Wales Law, which declared officially for the first time that the future of part-Aborigines lay in their assimilation into the economic and political life of the general Australian community.

When he revised his book on *The Australian Aborigines* in 1958,

Elkin wrote a new final chapter with the heading, 'Epilogue: The Aborigines on the March'. In this chapter, he wrote: 'This book has been written because it should be the desire, as it is the duty, of non-Aboriginal Australians to understand the Aborigines.'[5] He goes on to say, 'The future of the Aborigines, whether full-blood or other, lies within the general framework and current of Australian economic, political, social, and religious life. The old order is passing, and a new order is being entered through a process of assimilation; but the rate varies according to the types of Aborigines and their geographical position.'[6] But he qualifies the meaning of 'assimilation' a few pages later, when he says, 'Although the Aborigines more and more want to be a part of Australian life in their own right they want to reach this goal as Aborigines ... The nearer goal however, is that while still Aboriginal in many social and spiritual aspects of life, they will become full and responsible citizens not offending against essential features of our social behavior.'[7]

An assimilation policy developed in New Zealand with the rise of the Young Maori Party after 1900. Sir Peter Buck and Sir Apirana Ngata believed that the Maori population could be assimilated as a rural citizenry, with education and financial help from the Government to establish them as farmers.

---

5. *The Australian Aborigines*, p. 321.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 332.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 337.

Assimilation was seen as the appropriate goal by Raymond Firth, in his monumental *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, first published in 1928, with a revised edition in 1959, and reprinted in 1973. He noted the 'reshaping of their social institutions' that took place among the Maori in the period from 1910 to 1930, and saw it go even further toward assimilation by 1958, when he revised the book. Like Elkin, however, he made some qualifications of the assimilation policy as he saw it. In contrast with the more individualistic economic and social behavior of the Pakeha, the Maori had rebuilt their community meeting places (marae) and were still applying community controls to much of their social behavior. His comment was: 'If the watch-word be not assimilation but *incorporation* into the political, social, and economic body of the New Zealand community, then the Maori and the Pakeha with whom they share the country should hope in the long run for a working solution to their relationships.'[8]

The native culture is not being mixed mechanically into the dominant society and thus losing its identity, he seems to say. Rather, important elements of Maori culture are being *incorporated*, without losing their Maori character.

The anthropologists who followed Firth on the New Zealand scene in the 1950s and early 1960s were engaged in stretching the concept of assimilation to make it more inclusive of Maori cultural characteristics. Ralph Piddington is a leader of this group.

---

8. *Economics of the Modern Maori*, p. 482.

He applied the term 'social symbiosis' to describe a situation in which European and Maori culture traits could mutually support each other. This could hardly be called assimilation of Maori culture into European culture. In an essay for the book *The Maori People in the 1960s*, he used the concept of 'emergent development' of new culture forms in the Maori society. Emergent development, he wrote, consisted of 'positive and spontaneous emergence of new types of social institutions within cultures undergoing change.'[9] Such developments combine elements from both cultures, and this can hardly be seen as assimilation of the native culture into the western culture.

Assimilation policy in the USA had less support from anthropology than it had in the other two countries. When there was major controversy over assimilation policy, in the period from about 1870 to 1930, we do not find anthropologists taking much part in it. There was greater pressure for assimilation in some areas than in others, but the anthropologists seem to have been absent from where the controversies occurred. They studied Indian cultures, as ethnographers, and, since there was a wide variety of Indian tribes, they had plenty to do.

The issue of allotment of Indian lands to individual Indian owners was over assimilation. Those whites who favoured allotment

---

9. 'Emergent Development and Integration', in *The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties*, p. 260.

for non-selfish (non land-grabbing) reasons, did so because they thought that individual ownership and responsibility for land would make the Indian more thrifty, more individualistic, more foresighted - more like the 'ideal' American farm owner. Those who were opposed to allotment, believed that the 'Indian way' of communal use of land, and communal decision-making, and extended family responsibility for the welfare of individuals, was worth maintaining, at least as long as Indians preferred it that way. They trusted the Indians to know or to find out what was best for them.

The passage of the Dawes Act, in 1887, provided for the allotment of Indian land to individual Indian owners, who were expected to use the land efficiently, while land they could not use as individual farmers was to be sold to white farmers, or leased to cattlemen, with some cash payments to tribal members. These actions would tend to push the Indian into the economic position of the American landowner. He and his children could learn to use land efficiently, or by means of education they could learn some other occupations. The fact that this policy would not work out well had been anticipated by some people and recognized by others as the decades passed, and eventually, in 1934, the allotment practice was discontinued by Act of Congress. But, by that time, the Indians had lost most of their land. They were poor, ill-educated, and ill-adapted to participate in American Anglo society. These facts are pointed out in the Meriam Survey, published in 1928, but further attempts at assimilation were recommended. The Meriam Report concluded: 'The fundamental requirement is that the task of the Indian Service be recognized as primarily educat-

ional, in the broadest sense of that word, and that it be made an efficient educational agency, devoting its main energies to the social and economic advancement of the Indians, so that they may be absorbed into the prevailing civilization or be fitted to live in the presence of that civilization, at least in accordance with a minimum standard of health and decency.'[10]

Margaret Mead presented an acute critique of assimilation policy along with some of the complexity of cultural pluralism in an essay entitled 'Cultural Factors in Community-Education Programs', published in 1960. She illustrated her thinking about culture change and culture contact with three case studies of native societies, one of them being the 'Antler' tribe of Plains Indians who have suffered from assimilation policy gone wrong.

CULTURAL PLURALISM

Assimilation as a policy had been tried and found inadequate. Even though some people of the native race were successfully assimilated by the dominant society, they were few in number, despite the fact that the native population was growing rapidly in numbers, emigrating to the cities, and becoming a kind of semi-permanent lo r working class - poor, underemployed, and dissatisfied. Some of the younger members of the native group became militant, demanding more positive attention and assistance from the dominant group. Accordingly, anthropologists took an active part in defining and promoting the next policy step, toward cult-

10. *The Problem of Indian Administration*, p. 21.

ural pluralism.

This was seen most clearly in the Australian case, in which four anthropologists were especially important: Professor W.E.H. Stanner of the Australian National University was a member of the three-man Commonwealth Council on Aboriginal Affairs, which advised the Government on Aboriginal Affairs policy; husband-wife team of anthropologists at the University of Western Australia, Professor Ronald M. Berndt and Dr Catherine H. Berndt, wrote and spoke effectively; and Professor C.D. Rowley, a specialist in government, became the organizer and editor of a three-volume series on Aboriginal Affairs, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council of Australia. In fact, the Departments of Anthropology at all of the Australian universities had one or more staff members doing research and writing and speaking on Aboriginal Affairs, directed at a policy of cultural pluralism.

Excerpts from writings by Stanner and the Berndts will help to clarify the policy which went under various terms, and which I call cultural pluralism. Professor Stanner gave the Boyer Lectures in 1967, entitled 'After the Dreaming', which were published by the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Explaining the complexity of the problem of creating a true cultural pluralism, he said: 'Over the last thirty years we have been trying to attract them (Aborigines) into some sort of union with us. We call it "assimilation" and think of "integration" as an intermediate stage or perhaps a less complete union. But it is easy for us to overlook that a long humiliation can dull the vision, narrow the spirit, and contract the heart towards new things.

Some of the Aborigines do not understand our offer; some think it is not genuine; some, that its terms are not very attractive; some prefer to cling to their old identity until they are more sure what identity they will have within our new proposals for them. There are deeper difficulties still. We are asking them to become a new people but this means in human terms that we are asking them to un-be what they are now. But many of them are now seeking to rediscover who and what their people were before the long humiliation. It is a search for identity, a way of restoring self-esteem, of finding a new direction for the will to survive, and of making a better bargain of life on a more responsive market at a more understanding time.'[11]

Berndt clearly hopes for a viable form of cultural pluralism. Introducing a symposium on *Current Problems Among Aborigines*, which was published in 1969, he stressed the obstacles to a cultural identity for the Aborigines, and described conditions under which a fairly satisfactory Aboriginal identity might be achieved within a policy of cultural pluralism. He pointed out the following facts:

1. People of Aboriginal descent are participating much more positively in their own affairs, despite limited opportunities for communication with others, general socio-economic deprivation, and circumscribed opportunities for choice.

---

11. *After the Dreaming*, pp. 56-7.

2. Socio-economic disadvantage. A high proportion of people of Aboriginal descent have remained virtually anchored at a low socio-economic level – many at a bare subsistence level.

3. The provision of improved educational facilities is a major need. This is especially important for the part-Aboriginal people who live in or near the town and cities. They have become divorced from traditional Aboriginal life, but they suffer from restricted opportunities for education, training, and employment. 'In general terms, for children of Aboriginal descent, basic teaching about the wider Australian society needs to be strengthened and supplemented, to overcome the limited horizons of small-scale and often very narrow mission and government settlement living. And with this should go training in basic skills, and special help to cope with adaptation to changing conditions and to sophisticated economics ... Additionally, where broader issues of understanding and appreciating differing views and values are concerned, education is, or should be, a two-way process – relevant not only to people of Aboriginal descent but to other Australians as well.'

4. At present, 'there are two contrasting trends in Aboriginal life. One is a movement toward what can be called "Aboriginality"'. The other is a

> movement toward a more active role in the affairs of the wider Australian society, with eventual mergence. These two trends are not necessarily mutually reinforcing. [12]

In this last point, Professor Berndt states the essence of the problem of cultural pluralism as it affects the Aborigines. Nearly all part-Aborigines and a growing number of full Aborigines are so far removed from their traditional Aboriginal past that the essence of Aboriginality for them consists of knowledge about and experience in situations of contact, conflict, and cooperation with the European society. Their 'Aboriginality' is very different from that of people who have lived their lives in an isolated tribal culture. The 'Aboriginality' of the part-Aborigines is that of a sub-culture of the more comprehensive Australian culture, hemmed in by barriers which limit their opportunities and choices. In their attempts to develop an Aboriginal identity they have sought two things: a satisfactory place *within* that system; and a satisfactory place *outside* that system: and here lies the personal dilemma for many Aborigines, and the social problem for the Australian society.

Writing like this, and consultation with policy-makers, has led, I believe, to a development seen in the following three

---

12. Roland M. Berndth, 41st Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 1969, p. xvii.

quotations from men who were responsible for making government policy. The first is an essay on Commonwealth policy for Aboriginal Affairs by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr William C. Wentworth IV, written about 1968. Mr Wentworth, the fourth generation of a pioneer family prominent in Australian political life, was contrasting the policy of *assimilation* with an emerging policy which approaches what we call cultural pluralism. He pointed out that some Aboriginals favoured one policy, and some favoured another. 'From my point of view the important thing is that they have been put forward by Aboriginals. And let me summarize them briefly and crudely. There are some Aboriginals who say, "We want to become part of the community at any cost. We want education. We want housing. We want to forget our old ways. We want to have every kind of white-wash poured over us." There are others who say, "We want to preserve our own ways. You mustn't try to destroy the whole of the Aboriginal past. You mustn't try to destroy the whole of our Aboriginal culture." I put this very crudely, because a summarizer must and should be crude. We have to find some way of reconciling these views of Aboriginals, different Aboriginals, because in their reconciliation a policy has to emerge. I want to speak about the government's view ... It is of course – everybody would agree with this surely – impossible to preserve for the Aboriginals the status quo. I am not speaking of the southern and assimilated Aborginals. Nobody would believe, for example, that you could wall off Arnhem Land and leave it as it is, or leave it as it was perhaps, and let things go on there as they have gone on for the last few thousand years. Nobody would expect this. It is impossible. It would be rejected by everybody, I think – internationally, nat-

ionally and by Aboriginals. That is the first thing. The second thing is that we do not want to have any kind of compulsory and permanent apartheid in Australia. We work, not for a completely uniform society, but as we are involved in the general democratic framework, we work for some kind of pluralistic society where people are not all the same, although they have all "the same rights, privileges and responsibilities. That is a society where they have the power to maintain for themselves, inside their own group, the characteristics of that group ..." I quote from what was said officially in 1967 by our Aboriginals speaking of their development in a pluralistic society: "They may cherish, within the bounds of citizenship responsibility, their own languages, special customs, beliefs and values just as, for example, various immigrant or religious groups can do".'

Dr H.C. Coombs, the Chancellor of the Australian National University, formerly Head of the Reserve Bank of Australia, and Chairman of the Council on Aboriginal Affairs, gave a lecture in 1972 on 'The Future of the Australian Aboriginal'. He described four Aboriginal communities that have in recent years made notable progress toward the control and direction of their own future. He concluded as follows:

> 'Consideration of these examples leads, I think, to the conclusion that the life-style sought in each of them is practicable and modest. An Australian community committed to making it a reality for them and for comparable communities would be assuming no impossible or overwhelming burden. There is, however, one aspect of the aspirations of all these groups which I believe, will surprise most

> Australians: that is the emphasis in all of them on "separateness" and "distinctiveness"; on a future in which their Aboriginal identity would be apparent and acknowledged. There is no evidence to my eyes of any of the Aboriginal groups having chosen, or being prepared to choose, as official assimilationist policy in the past assumed they would, to live by the same standards and to pursue the same purposes as white Australians.'[13]

Then, in 1973, after a Labour Party victory in the 1972 general election, the Prime Minister, Mr Whitlam, made the following statement to the Ministerial Australian Affairs Council (6 April 1973):

> 'The basic object of my Government's policy is to restore to the Aboriginal people of Australia their lost power of self-determination in economic, social and political affairs. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Bryant, will be introducing into Parliament, I hope during the budget session, legislation to enable Aboriginal groups and communities to incorporate for the conduct of their own affairs. We see these incorporated societies, set up for purposes chosen by their Aboriginal members, determining their own decision-making processes, choosing their own leaders and executives in ways they

---

13. 'The Future of the Australian Aboriginal', p. 25.

will themselves decide as the primary instruments of Aboriginal authority at the local and community level.

'The Government will also set up, on the advice of Aborigines, procedures for the election of freely-chosen Aboriginal representatives from the various regions of Aboriginal population to form a consultative council with which the Government will confer on matters affecting Aborigines. Mr Bryant has already convened initial meetings towards the establishment of this body.

'Traditional Aboriginal societies have had close associations with specific areas of land, and there are many Aboriginal communities which have maintained that association substantially unbroken. In respect of land reserved for Aboriginal use and benefit it is the firm policy of the Government to vest such lands in the Aborigines, as far as practicable in ways which accord with traditional Aboriginal law and practice. Mr Justice E.A. Woodward has been commissioned to confer with Aboriginal communities concerned and to advise the legislative and administrative actions required. His enquiry will also, of course, extend to land outside reserves. The Government will await with interest his recommendations in respect of those situations where traditional association can be established for such land outside reserves ....

'This policy of re-establishing the traditional association of Aboriginal communities with the land is linked with support for the preservation and development of Aboriginal languages and culture generally. A start has already been made in basing the education of Aborigines on literacy first in their own tribal tongue. Increasing support will be given to Aboriginal arts and Aborigines will be helped where they wish to do so to maintain the active ceremonial life on which these arts were traditionally based.

'An opportunity for self-determination and independent action would serve little purpose if Aborigines continued to be economically and socially deprived. The Government therefore plans to help them as individuals, groups or communities, in crafts trades and professions and as business entrepreneurs. To this end programmes of socially valuable special work projects, vocational training, and grants and loans in support of enterprises, will be actively promoted.'

CULTURAL PLURALISM IN NEW ZEALAND

The same progression in thinking and in policy from assimilation to pluralism is to be seen in New Zealand, but in a somewhat less dramatic form.

The Secretary for Maori Affairs, Mr J.K. Hunn, was assigned the task of surveying the circumstances of the Maori people as of 1960 and of reporting to the Government with recommendations for what steps might be taken. He collected data, sought advice from a variety of people, and wrote a report in 1961 which was almost immediately published as a government document. Mr Hunn had apparently not expected publication of the report in that form, but it seems to have served a useful purpose, in that it stated a general policy which was widely discussed, and generally approved, so that it may be seen, now, as a landmark on the path of policy development. The Hunn Report tried to state a general policy, which would go beyond assimilation.

Possible relations between the Anglo and the Maori cultures were stated, as follows:

> 'Evolution is clearly integrating Maori and pakeha. Consequently "integration" is said to be the official policy whenever the question is asked. In theory, the alternatives are assimilation, integration, segregation, and symbiosis, which terms are intended to mean:
>
> 'Assimilation: To become absorbed, blended, amalgamated, with complete loss of Maori culture.
>
> 'Integration: To combine (not fuse) the Maori and pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct.

'Segregation: To enforce a theoretical concept of "apartheid". One school of thought in New Zealand advocates "parallel development," which in essence is segregation under another name.

'Symbiosis: To have two dissimilar peoples living together but as separate entities with the smaller deriving sustenance from the larger (seemingly an attempt to integrate and segregate at the same time).'[14]

The concept of *integration* involves some semantic difficulties, as it has been used in connection with ethnic relations in New Zealand, Australia and the USA. It has been used with somewhat different meanings in the three countries, and seems better omitted from the present discussion, though it clearly is an advance from *assimilation* toward *cultural pluralism.*

A number of anthropologists and social psychologists in New Zealand have been thinking and writing about cultural pluralism during the past ten years. The most active ones have naturally been located in the North Island, where the great majority of Maoris live. Auckland University, Victoria University (Wellington), University of Waikato (Hamilton) and Massey University (Palmerston North) all have Anthropology, Education, and Psychology staff members studying Maori culture. There are

14. *Report on Department of Maori Affairs*, p. 15.

substantial numbers of Maori students, especially at Auckland and Victoria Universities. To illustrate the influence of anthropologists, we shall refer to two persons – Erik Schwimmer and Joan Metge.

Schwimmer, who was editor of *Te Ao Hou*, a Maori literary and cultural journal, put together a set of papers from various authors under the title, *The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties*. These papers show rather clearly the progression of thought and of social goal from assimilation to cultural pluralism, which he calls *biculturism*. In his Introductory Chapter, 'Needed – A New Theory on Maori Social Development', he formulates a definition of cultural pluralism, with reference to the Maori and Anglo cultures in New Zealand in terms of two basic principles – *Inclusion and Biculturism*.

Inclusion is a term that comes from the sociologist Talcott Parsons and, in a situation involving two main cultures, it means:

1. Equal civil rights for members of both groups.

2. Full sharing in the process of government and the exercise of power.

3. Equal opportunities, gained through equality of resources and capacities.

Biculturism means that each cultural group:

1. Accepts as legitimate the values of a second culture in the society.

2. Is to some extent familiar with the other culture.

3. Consciously reconciles the value systems of the two cultures, though choices may have to be made.

Schwimmer says clearly that biculturism, to become a reality, requires:

1. Education that makes the capacities and achievements of the two cultural groups equivalent.

2. Better housing and higher income for the group with the lesser socio-economic status.

Joan Metge, of the Department of Anthropology at Victoria University, grew up in Auckland, knows Maori people intimately, and has built her career on studies of Maori culture. In the conclusion of her book, *The Maoris of New Zealand* she closes with a chapter on 'Maori and Pakeha' with the following:

'The Hunn Report defined integration as "to combine

(not fuse) the Maori and Pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct". Later statements, though little clearer, suggest that the Government interprets this to mean eliminating differences that involve inequality and discrimination, and helping Maoris to retain their language and culture if they want to. Translating this policy into action poses some interesting problems. Do certain differentiating laws involve unnecessary privilege or compensation for disability? What if the Maoris themselves prefer inequality to change?

'Maoris generally accept "integration" as a goal, but often question Government implementation of it. They allege (for instance) that recent land measures, encouragement of urban migration, and the "pepper-potting" of Maori houses among Pakeha ones further assimilation rather than integration, and complain that not enough is done actively to foster Maoritanga.[15] Most agree that their future is bound up with that of the Pakeha, and give little support to nationalistic or separatist movements. At the same time, they are determined to retain their own identity.

'The large majority would endorse the ideal of inte-

15. Maoriness, Maori ways, pride in being Maori (Metge).

gration as defined by the Presbyterian Maori Synod: 'As we understand it, integration is the combination of the Maori and Pakeha peoples of the nation into one harmonious community in which each enjoys the privileges and accepts the responsibilities of their common citizenship, wherein there are no racial barriers and wherein, with mutual understanding and respect, each race is free to cherish its cultural heritage, that in this way the best elements of both cultures may be united to form the pattern of future New Zealand society.'

'The idea of fusion – the development of a truly New Zealand culture incorporating both existing cultures – is acceptable for the distant future, but arouses no enthusiasm as an immediate goal ....

'Year by year Maoris and Pakehas extend the area of their common culture by developing new patterns in association, in response to the same internal and external stimuli. This is particularly true in the fields of sport, soldiering and popular entertainment, in all of which Maoris have achieved national prominence. Recently also, several artists and writers, making use of ideas and techniques from both cultures, have produced work that adds an exciting new dimension to the arts in New Zealand. Prominent among these are the poets Alistair Campbell and Hone Tuwhare, artists Rau Hotere, Para Matchitt,

Selwyn Muru and Theo Schoon, and the sculptor Arnold Wilson; but there are many more, especially (which is significant) among the younger generation ....

'Four factors in the situation give grounds for hoping that Maoris and Pakehas can not merely avoid conflict, but effect a positive improvement in their relations. In the first place, both groups include some persons of mixed ancestry and many who have relatives in the other. Persons of mixed descent do not form a separate group. Maoris accept anyone with Maori ancestry as Maori; Pakehas accept those who look Pakeha without difficulty and those who look Maori if they 'live up to Pakeha standards'. Secondly, classification is extremely elastic. There is no clear-cut legal or administrative definition: the individual can largely make his own choice. Many claim to belong to different groups at different times, and more and more proudly assert with Peter Buck that they are *both* Maori *and* Pakeha. Thirdly, relations are both varied and open to change. Attitudes and patterns of behaviour differ from area to area, with economic status and education, and with individual personality and background. People act differently in different situations, and frequently change their minds in the light of experience.

Finally, both Maoris and Pakehas hold firmly to the belief that they are are 'one people', united in friendship and equality.'[16]

CULTURAL PLURALISM IN THE USA

To speak of cultural pluralism in the USA brings to mind a diversity of cultures, in addition to the Anglo. There is the black or Afro-American, the Oriental-American, the Spanish-American, and the American Indian, not to mention the European ethnic groups, such as Polish, Italian, Irish, Greek, and Yugoslav. There is a definite movement toward a cultural pluralism that embraces all these groups. We will limit ourselves here to discussion of the American Indian in relation to the Anglo culture.

The architect of the 'Indian New Deal', as the new policies of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt were called, was John Collier. Though not an anthropologist, his close professional and family associates were anthropologists, and he represented their views quite well. Ruth Underhill, Gordon Macgregor, Clyde Kluckhohn, Laura Thompson, were closely associated with him during the 1940s, when his programme was put into practice.

Collier's watchword was *self-determination* for Indian tribes, on a tribal basis. He treated each tribe as a unit. The Indian

---

16. *The Maoris of New Zealand*, pp. 213-8.

Reorganization Act of 1934 gave each tribe the power to elect a Tribal Council, which had the power to make and enforce laws (within certain limitations), to incorporate and conduct business enterprises. Collier's policies held sway until about 1950, when there was a reaction back toward assimilation, through the mechanism of terminating the reservations and dividing the land and other resources among the tribal members. That policy worked out badly, and was abandoned after 1958, with only a few reservations terminated. With the election of John F. Kennedy to the Presidency, and with Stuart Udall named Secretary of the Interior, the urgent question of Indian Policy came to the fore again. Udall appointed a Task Force to advise on Indian policy. This group contained people with a good deal of Indian experience. Chairman was W.W. Keeler, a part-Indian, who was honorary Chairman of the Cherokee Tribe. Among the members were James Officer and Philleo Nash, both anthropologists. Mr Nash, who had been Lieutenant-Governor of the State of Wisconsin, was later appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

President Johnson appointed another Task Force in 1966. Both of these groups urgently recommended measures for assisting the economic development of Indians through tribal action. The emphasis was on tribal self-determination, with government financial aid when the tribe decided on a programme of economic development. The general trend of government policy throughout the decade was toward greater self-determination. For example, all schools for Indians administered by the federal government were directed in 1968 to establish advisory boards from among the parents and local community leaders. President Nixon's message

to Congress on Indian Affairs, in 1970, was explicit on cultural pluralism. He said,'I am asking Congress to pass a new concurrent Resolution which would expressly renounce, repudiate and repeal the termination policy as expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress. This resolution would explicitly affirm the integrity and right to continued existence of all Indian tribes and Alaska native governments, recognizing that cultural pluralism is a source of national strength.'

Thus the decade of the 1960s was following the direction charted in 1961 by the American Indian Chicago Conference when the Indians making up the Conference declared:

> 'In order to give recognition to certain basic philosophies by which the Indian People live, we, the Indian People, must be governed by principles in a democratic manner with a right to choose our way of life. Since our Indian culture is threatened by presumption of being absorbed by the American society, we believe we have the responsibility of preserving our precious heritage. We believe that the Indians must provide the adjustment and thus freely advance with dignity to a better life.'[17]

To the development of Indian policy during the 1960s, several anthropologists and sociologists made contributions. Professor

---

17. *The Voice of the American Indian: Declaration of Indian Purpose*, p. 4.

Sol Tax of the University of Chicago was one of the leaders in organizing the Chicago Conference of 1961. He and Professor Robert Thomas of Wayne State University kept the magazine *Indian Voices* going during most of this decade. Professor Murray Wax, a sociologist, and his wife, Rosalie Wax, have studied Indian schools in South Dakota and in Oklahoma, and have recommended a type of instruction which fits the Indian culture and makes the Indian youth feel more 'at home' in the school. Professor Nancy Oestreich Lurie of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee has made a useful analysis of cultural pluralism in the book entitled *North American Indians in Historical Perspective* in which she stresses the importance of *articulation* of Indians as *groups* into the larger society. This is the desirable alternative to assimilation as *individuals* in the larger society. The technique for developing cultural pluralism, she says, involves Indian self-determination, organized inter-tribal activities, and diffusion of pan-Indian traits. Her stress on inter-tribal cooperation and pan-Indianism is a notable contribution to thinking about cultural pluralism. Also, she stresses a need for 'a decent material foundation for existence, with Indian identity maintained and activity utilized as an essential component of satisfactory community life'.[18]

A school board member for the Rough Rock School on the Navaho reservation, John Dick, made the following statement in 1968:

---

18. *North American Indians in Historical Perspective*, p. 419.

'We want our children to be proud of being Navajos. We want them to know who they are ... In the future they will have to be able to make many choices and do many different things. They need a modern education to make their way, but they have to know both worlds – and being Navajo will give them strength.'[19]

FUNCTIONS OF EDUCATION FOR CULTURAL PLURALISM

What do anthropologists do, in their role as teachers, to foster movement toward cultural pluralism? Their educational activities fall into three categories:

1. *Education of Opinion-formers and Policy-makers*

   They write, counsel and speak to members of government, to journalists and other people who take some responsibility for leadership on matters of public policy. Examples of this kind of activity have been given.

2. *General Education of the Public*

   They write, and lecture, and teach about the cultures of various ethnic groups, so as to

19. Fuchs and Havighurst, *To Live on this Earth: American Indian Education*, p. 246.

increase the understanding of people and also the mutual respect of members of various cultural groups for one another. They prepare materials for adults and for school-age youth. Examples of anthropologists or sociologists who have been especially active in this connection are:

USA

John Collier, Jr., Malcolm Carr Collier, Robert Dumont, Estelle Fuchs, Fred Gearing, Clyde Kluckhohn, Nancy Lurie, Margaret Mead, Gordon Macgregor, George Spindler, Sol Tax, Murray and Rosalie Wax.

New Zealand

Richard Benton, Bruce Biggs, Raymond Firth, John Harré, Patrick Hopepa, Joan Metge, J.R. McCreary, Ralph Piddington, James and Jane Ritchie, Erik Schwimmer, Rangi Walker, John E. Watson.

Australia

R.M. and C.H. Berndth, M.J.C. Calley, A.P. Elkin, P.M.C. Hasluck, F. Lancaster Jones, Lorna Lippmann, J.P.M. Long, B. Nurcombe, Marie Reay, C.D. Rowley, W.E.H. Stanner, Ronald Taft, C.M. Tatz, Betty H. Watts.

3. *Education of the Minority Group*

Members of the minority group or groups are part of the general public for the kinds of education mentioned above. In addition, they are likely to get special attention because of their minority group membership. This special education is aimed at helping them maintain a group identity, pride in their group, and their tribal language. Anthropologists are likely to be involved in the selection or preparation of teaching material aimed at this goal.

CONCLUSION

Although there appears to be a substantial commitment to cultural pluralism in these three countries, at least a decade of social evolution will be necessary to work the concept into reality and to test its viability. The policy has been developed so far in a favourable environment. Young people in general appear to favour it. The Anglo society is permissive, and regards it increasingly as an issue to be worked out by the minority cultural groups. The dominant society is willing to provide enough socio-economic support so that members of the minority groups will not have to suffer from sheer, abject poverty, which would probably make cultural pluralism impossible.

Still, the story is far from complete, and continued participation by anthropologists will probably be useful.

REFERENCES

Australia

Coombs, H.C. 'The Future of the Australian Aboriginal', Cohen Memorial Lecture (University of Sydney, 1972).

Elkin, A.P. *Australian Aborigines*, 2nd ed. (Sydney, 1959; also, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1964).

Rowley, C.D. *The Remote Aborigines* (Ringwood, Victoria, Australia: Penguin Books Australia Ltd., 1972).

Stanner, W.E.H. *After the Dreaming*, Boyer Lectures (Australian Broadcasting Commission, 1967).

Stevens, Frank, ed., *Racism: The Australian Experience, vol. 2, Black versus White* (Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Book Co., 1972).

Wentworth, William C. 'The Role of the Commonwealth', pp. 182-5 in *Aboriginal Progress: A New Era*, ed. D.E. Hutchison (Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 1969).

New Zealand

Firth, Raymond. *Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, 2nd ed. (Wellington: Government Printer, 1959).

Hunn, J.K. *Report on Department of Maori Affairs* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1961).

Metge, Joan. *The Maoris of New Zealand* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).

Piddington, Ralph. 'Emergent Development and Integration', pp. 257-69, in *The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties*, ed. Erik Schwimmer.

Schwimmer, Erik, ed., *The Maori People in the Nineteen Sixties* (Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul, Ltd. 1968).

USA

American Indian Chicago Conference. *The Voice of the American Indian: Declaration of Indian Purpose* (Chicago: University of Chicag. ress, 1961).

Fuchs, Estelle and Robert J. Havighurst. *To Live on This Earth: American Indian Education* (New York: Doubleday, 1972).

Leacock, Eleanor Burke, and Lurie, Nancy Oestreich, eds., *North American Indians in Historical Perspective* (New York: Random House, 1971).

Mead, Margaret. 'Cultural Factors in Community-Education Programs', pp. 66-96, in *Community Education*, 58th Yearbook, Part I, National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

Meriam, Lewis, ed., *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928).

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Oxford History of the American People* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Spindler, George D. ed., *Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963).

Striner, Herbert E. 'A Program for the Training, Employment, and Economic Equality of the American Indian', unpublished paper (Washington, D.C.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1968).

Wax, Murray L. *Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).